

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 were previously pending in the application. Claim 2 is canceled; claims 1, 3-4, 9, and 11 are amended; and new claims 24-28 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 3-28 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

On page 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 9-12, and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Erb. On page 2, the Examiner objected to claims 4-8 and 13-16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable over Erb.

Claim 1 is amended to include the recitations of original claim 2 (now canceled). Amended claim 1 now recites, inter alia, a first optical filter inserted into the fiber, wherein the first filter is adapted to direct light corresponding to the first sensor between the fiber and the first sensor.

In the rejection of original claim 2, on page 2 of the office action, the Examiner pointed to Erb's Figs. 1 and 6 and stated that "Erb discloses ... a filter [that] is adapted to direct light to the first sensor between the fiber and the first sensor." The Examiner did not provide any pointers to explain which element shown in Erb's Figs. 1 and 6 the Examiner considers to be an example of the first optical filter recited in claim 1.

Erb's Fig. 1 shows an optical system, in which light from light source **21** is directed by reflector **28** into optical fiber **17** having fiber section **7** and sensor **9**. Fluorescent emission excited by this light in sensor **9** exits fiber **17** and is directed, through band-stop filter **26**, to detector **27**. Band-stop filter **26** filters out the fundamental excitation light to enable detection of the (relatively weak) fluorescent emission generated by sensor **9**. Erb's Fig. 6 shows additional details of sensor cartridge **10** that contains sensor **9**.

First of all, it is submitted that Erb's Figs. 1 and 6 do not show any optical filters inserted into the optical fiber. Indeed, apart from fiber section **7** and sensor **9**, Erb's Fig. 1 shows only one additional optical element, i.e., coupling capillary **15**, that is located within the optical fiber. Functional description of coupling capillary **15** is found in Erb's col. 13, lines 9-21, and reads as follows:

Positioning apparatus body (**13**) is mounted on a translating component (**11**) which slides along track (**12**). Track (**12**) is mounted on the sensor housing, as is coupling capillary support (**18**), in a manner such that fiber assembly (**7**) is brought into coupling capillary (**15**) when positioning apparatus body (**13**) is translated along track (**12**) in the direction of capillary coupler (**15**). When fiber assembly (**7**) has been brought into contact with annularizing fiber (**17**) in coupling capillary (**15**), a screw is tightened to hold positioning apparatus body (**13**) in that location. To change cartridges, said screw is loosened, positioning apparatus body (**13**) is translated away from coupling capillary (**15**) along track (**12**), hinged support (**19**) is unclamped and opened and sensor cartridge (**10**) is replaced.

It is clear from this description that coupling capillary **15** serves to ease mechanical attachment of sensor cartridge **10** to optical fiber **17**, and does not perform any optical filtering functions. As such, coupling capillary **15** is not an example of the "first optical filter inserted into the fiber" recited in claim 1.

Regarding reflector **28** and band-stop filter **26**, it should first be noted that these optical elements are stand-alone optical elements that are not in any direct physical contact with fiber 17. As such, neither of these elements can possibly serve as an example of the “first optical filter inserted into the fiber,” as explicitly recited in claim 1. In addition, claim 1 specifies that “the first filter is adapted to direct light ... between the fiber and the first sensor.” In contrast, reflector **28** is adapted to direct light between light source **21** and fiber 17, and not between fiber 17 and sensor **9** (see Erb’s Fig. 1). Similarly, band-stop filter **26** is adapted to direct light between fiber 17 and detector **27**, and not between fiber 17 and sensor **9** (see Erb’s Fig. 1).

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Erb. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 17 and 20 are also allowable over Erb. Since claims 3-16, 18-19, and 21-23 depend variously from claims 1, 17, and 20, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over Erb.

Support for new claim 24 can be found, e.g., in original claim 11 and page 6, lines 12-15. Claim 24 recites, inter alia, a catheter that is adapted to be inserted into a blood vessel to enable the first sensor to sense blood pressure in said blood vessel.

The Applicant submits that Erb’s sensor cartridge **10** is not adapted to be inserted into a blood vessel because the sensor cartridge has large and massive support blocks **19** (see Erb’s Fig. 6) that are simply not compatible with such insertion. Furthermore, nowhere in her specification does Erb teach or even suggest that sensor **9** can be used to sense blood pressure in a blood vessel.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 24 is allowable over Erb. It is further submitted that the same reasons that make claim 24 allowable over Erb also serve as additional reasons for the allowability of claim 11.

New claims 25, 27, and 28 are equivalent to original claims 13, 15, and 16, respectively, rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that claims 13, 15, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claims 25, 27, and 28 are allowable.

Support for new claim 26 can be found, e.g., in original claim 14. Since claim 26 depends from allowable claim 25, it is submitted that claim 26 is also allowable over Erb.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/20/2006
Customer No. 46850
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Yuri Gruzdkov/
Yuri Gruzdkov
Registration No. 50,762
Agent for Applicant
(215) 557-8544 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)